

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT PHILPOTT AND PATRICIA
ANN MURRY,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CHARLETTE SNEED, ET AL.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 07cv1139 BTM(LSP)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS;
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
CASE SHOULD NOT BE
REMANDED**

On June 22, 2007, Defendant Charlette Sneed removed this action from the Superior Court of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446. Defendant also filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP").

The Court has considered Defendant's declaration in support of her motion to proceed IFP, and finds that she has made a sufficient showing of inability to pay the filing fee. Accordingly, Defendant's IFP Motion is **GRANTED**.

Defendant contends that the Court has diversity jurisdiction over the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). However, it is unclear whether the action is between citizens of different states. There is a "strong presumption" against removal jurisdiction, and the defendant always has the burden of establishing that removal is proper. Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992).

Accordingly, Defendant is **ORDERED** to show cause why this case should not be

1 remanded to state court. The parties may file papers in response to this OSC on or before
2 July 23, 2007. The matter will be set for hearing on **July 27, 2007 at 11:00 a.m.** Unless
3 otherwise directed by the Court, there shall be no oral argument and no personal
4 appearances are required.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 DATED: July 2, 2007

7 
8

9 Hon. Barry Ted Moskowitz
United States District Judge

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28